AF Essentials Observation Rubric: 2012-2013

Overview of the Essentials Rubric

The Essentials Rubric is designed to measure the Ten Essentials of Great Instruction and the overall effect of a lesson on student achievement outcomes. There are 4 key domains of instruction: **Domain 1: A Clear and High Bar for Student Achievement, Domain 2: Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson, Domain 3: Classroom Culture, and Domain 4: Ensures Achievement for all Scholars.** These domains have been broken down into 10 Essentials of Great Instruction. Some of the Essentials have been broken down into Sub-Essentials in order to define a category more clearly.

Domains of Instruction		Essentials	Value	Percent of Total	Rubric Page #
Domain 1: A Clear, High Standard for Student Achievement **Total Domain Weight: 32%**	1	Great Aims	2	8%	3
	2	Assessment of Aims	2	8%	4
		a. Checks for Understanding	1		
		b. Daily Assessment	1		
	3	Academic Rigor	4	16%	5-6
		a. Rigorous Questioning	2		
		b. Standards for Top-Quality Responses (Oral & Written)	2		
Domain 2: Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson **Total Domain Weight: 32%**	4	Core Instruction of the Aim	5	20%	7-8
		a. Evidence of Planning	2		
		b. Effective and Efficient Delivery	3		
	5	Independent Work Time	2	8%	9
	6	Scholar Engagement	2	8%	10-11
		a. Pacing	1		
		b. Effective Use of engagement strategies	1		
Domain 3: Classroom Culture **Total Domain Weight: 16%**	7	Classroom Culture	4	16%	12-14
		a. High Expectations	2		
		b. Positive Classroom Climate	1		
		c. Embedded Character	1		
Domain 4: Ensures Achievement for all Scholars **Total Domain Weight: 20%**	8	Cumulative Review	1	4%	15
	9	Overall Outcome: Scholar Learning	3	12%	17
		Total	25	100%	

Scoring the Essentials

Each of the Essentials and Sub-Essentials is given one rating based on the five point scale below.

- **Level 5 Exemplary**: Consistently best practice instruction that gives a high degree of confidence in breakthrough achievement gains
- **Level 4 Strong**: Instruction aligned to best practices that gives strong confidence of achievement gains to consistently meet ambitious AF targets
- **Level 3 Solid**: Solid instruction aligned to best practices that will likely lead to solid scholar achievement gains
- **Level 2 Emergent:** Instruction that is mixed in quality of execution and may lead to scholar achievement concerns
- **Level 1 Ineffective:** Instruction that could lead to very serious scholar achievement concerns

Performance Indicators
In order to measure each ***Essential or Sub-Essential,*** several ***performance indicators*** have been identified to determine an overall score. These performance indicators are the description of evidence an observer will see in order to evaluate the lesson. This detailed description will not only improve observation norming, but it will give teachers more specific, targeted feedback on how to develop their practice on a particular domain.

Using Performance Indicators to Determine Ratings
Within each Essential, the final rating is not an average of the performance indicators. Instead, the observer considers the Essential holistically and what was most important for the success of a particular lesson. The rubric helps an observer to determine this rating by placing the most important performance indicator first in order to differentiate its significance in determining an overall score.

In some parts of the rubric, the description of the highest level of performance for a particular indicator is represented in a cell that is merged over multiple ratings (4 and 5 or 3, 4, and 5). When this is the case, the observer considers the effectiveness of the overall Essential to determine the overall rating. For example, if a teacher has a 4/5 on one performance indicator and 4s in two other performance categories, the overall rating for the Essential would be a 4.

For a teacher to earn a rating of 5 for an Essential, the teacher must earn the highest level of performance for each performance indicator within that Essential/Sub-Essential. For example, in Great Aims, if a teacher earns the highest rating for each performance indicator (4/5 for effective aim, alignment and rigor, 5 for explanation of aim and connection to prior learning and 3/4/5 for posting of aims), she earns an overall rating of 5.

Guidance for Using N/A
N/A should be used sparingly at the Essential level. The edits to the 2012-13 edition of the rubric should eliminate almost all need to N/A an entire Essential.

N/A can be used at the indicator level at the discretion of the observer. In most lessons, the observer will provide a rating for almost all indicators for each Essential but may decide to give 1 or 2 N/As. For example, an observer may give an N/A for Visual Anchor: Standard of Excellence in Essential 3b: Top Quality Responses because the lesson did not require scholar written work.

1. A Clear, High Standard for Student Achievement: Great Aims[1]					Value: 2 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
Effective Aim[2]	• The aim is bite-sized, measurable[3], standards-based, and part of a logical sequence for ALL scholars (this signifies that the teacher has considered whether or not the aim is measurable, bite-sized, and part of a logical sequence for all scholars and, only when appropriate, has differentitaed[4] the aim for select students).		• The aim is aligned to standards, but it may be missing **one component**, for example it might not be bite-sized for ALL scholars but it does convey what scholars will know and be able to do by the end of the lesson and does have a significant impact on focusing scholar learning.	• The aim is not aligned to standards or may be missing **one component** that has a significant impact on focusing student learning or **missing more than one component**, for example it might not be measurable but it does attempt to convey what scholars will know and be able to do by the end of the lesson.	• The aim is missing completely or is so unclear or vague that it does ***not*** convey what scholars are learning and what they will be able to do by the end of the lesson.
Alignment	• The aim clearly drives the activity in the lesson (***not*** vice versa).		• The lesson activity is aligned to the aim, but at 1-2 key moments instruction focuses more on completing the activity rather than mastery of the aim.	• The lesson activity is on topic, but instruction focuses more on completing the activity than mastering the aim.	• The lesson is an activity driven lesson that is disconnected from an aim.
Rigor	• The aim is rigorous and really pushes all scholars; it is at the right level to challenge scholars, without causing frustration or wasted time.		• The aim is rigorous and really pushes scholars; it is at the right level to challenge scholars, although for a small number of scholars the lesson feels like wasted time and that they could have been pushed further.	• The aim is either not rigorous enough for **most scholars** (most scholars either had mastery of the aim before the class started or were able to master it within the first 5-10 minutes of the lesson) or the aim was at the frustration point for **most scholars.**	• The aim is either not rigorous enough for **all scholars** (most scholars either had mastery of the aim before the class started or were able to master it within the first 5-10 minutes of the lesson) or the aim was at the frustration point for **all scholars.**
Explanation of the Aim[5]	• Scholars can explain why the aim matters in their own words and how the aim ties to broader course and unit goals.	• Scholars can explain the aims for the lesson in their own words. • Teacher strategically refers back to the aim throughout the lesson.	• The teacher clearly explains the importance of the aim. Scholars are not expected to explain the aim.	• The teacher explanation of the aim or its importance is confusing and may lead to scholar misunderstanding.	• Scholars are clearly confused about what they are supposed to be learning as the teacher explanation is confusing or missing.
Connection to Prior Learning	• Teacher and/or scholars make connections between this lesson and the unit's essential questions/enduring understandings.	• Teacher and scholars both effectively connect the aim to prior learning.	• Teacher may clearly connect the aim to prior learning but does not ask scholars to make a connection.	• Teacher attempts to connect the lesson to prior learning but it is incorrect or confusing.	• Teacher does not connect the lesson to prior learning or makes an incorrect connection.
Posting of Aims	• The aim and agenda are posted clearly and neatly in a highly-visible and consistent place (which could include the student packet for teachers with traveling classrooms).			• The aim is posted.	• The aim is not posted for the lesson.

Notes:

1) Key criteria for all aims: Standards based, measurable, bite-sized, part of a logical sequence for all scholars. Bite-sized indicates that the learning can be accomplished within the time allocated.
2) If a lesson scores a 1 on the first indicator (Effective Aim), it cannot score higher than a 1 for the Great Aims section.
3) It must be clear in the language or presentation of the aim how performance will be measured. Possibilities include using a conditional statement ("by **annotating** for x," "by **thinking** x"), or including specific criteria for success, or some other way to show scholars how they will demonstrate mastery.
4) Few lessons will have differentiated aims. If the aim is strategically differentiated for a subset of scholars or even one scholar, it is not necessary to post the differentiated aim(s).
5) On very *rare* occasions, it ***may not be*** appropriate to state an aim for a lesson (for example, this might be true for an inquiry lesson where the aim would "give away" the key learning the teacher is driving toward or during a lesson which is framed by an essential question). In these cases, an observer should evaluate the teacher based on whether the scholars are engaged in work that moves them toward mastery of an aim, even if it is ***not*** stated to scholars at the beginning of the lesson.

2. A Clear, High Standard for Student Achievement : Assessment of Aims[1]					Value: 2 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
2a: Checks for Understanding (CFUs) (1 unit): ***Examples of Checks for Understanding**: Mini white boards, asking clarifying questions, using turn and talks, circulating to review scholar work, having scholars vote on answer choices, asking scholars to rephrase materials, signals like thumbs up/down, A,B,C,D cards, electronic clickers, conferencing with scholars during Writer's Workshop * **Examples of Ways to Adjust Instruction Based on Data:** 1) Unscramble the confusion in the moment (includes--teacher re-explains, teacher asks follow up questions to pinpoint misunderstanding, teacher enlists other scholars by asking for agreement with a student response, have another student re-explain, and then cycling back to first student, persevere and then return to see if other examples increase understanding) or 2) Do nothing (a. if students demonstrated understanding, then move on to the next part of the lesson or b. sometimes data from a check for understanding may reveal a larger misunderstanding and addressing it in the moment will increase confusion; the teacher may acknowledge in their notes or verbally to the scholar).					
Quality and Selection of CFU[2]	• The teacher selects CFUs that provide reliable data to assess progress towards mastery of the aim of all students in the class.[3] • The CFUs strike the right balance between lower level (Bloom's levels 1 and 2) and higher level (Bloom's levels 3-6). • Teacher gathers data at **all** key points using CFUs.		• The teacher selects CFUs that provide reliable data to assess progress towards mastery of the aim for at least 70% of the class.[4] • The CFUs include both lower and higher level checks, but the ratio of questions is not optimal in either direction. • Teacher misses **one** of the key points to collect data. This missing data point doesn't create a significant breakdown in student learning.	• The teacher selects CFUs that provide reliable data to assess progress towards mastery of the aim for less than 70% of the class. • The teacher only asks low level CFUs. • Teacher uses CFUs to gather data from scholars, but does not collect data at the most important points resulting in significant challenges for scholars.	• Teacher does ***not*** use any CFUs during the lesson.
Use of Data	• When CFUs reveal scholar misunderstandings, the teacher's responses are **always** appropriate, effective, and efficiently executed.	• When CFUs reveal scholar misunderstandings, the teacher's responses are **usually** appropriate, effective, and efficiently executed with only 1- 2 minor exceptions.	• When CFUs reveal scholar misunderstandings, the teacher's responses are **usually** appropriate, effective, and efficiently executed; however, on 3 occasions clarity and/or efficiency could be improved.	• When CFUs reveal scholar misunderstandings, the teacher's responses **rarely** unscramble confusion, are inefficient, and/or are not the appropriate response to the misunderstanding.	• Teacher does ***not*** attempt to use the data from the CFUs.
2b: Daily Assessment (1 unit)					
Ability to Assess Mastery	The assessment: • Meets all indicators at level 4. • There is a mechanism for students to self-assess as they complete their daily assessment. *In lower grades (2nd and below), students can explain how they know what they learned in the day's lesson, i.e. a quick interview with a student.*	The assessment: • allows the teacher to determine whether scholars mastered all elements of the daily aim, • reveals common misunderstandings, • is differentiated[5] (when appropriate) • gives information about student understanding of upcoming aims (when appropriate).	The assessment is aligned to the lesson aim and differentiated when appropriate for scholars, but • may ***not be fully*** comprehensive in assessing the aim, **or** • ***may only partially*** uncover misunderstandings thus providing good but not great data.	The assessment: • is only partially aligned to the lesson aim, **or** may be poorly written/confusing to complete, **or** may not assess the aim in a rigorous way, (i.e. does not reveal misunderstandings), • is not differentiated when it should have been.	• There is no systematic way to assess scholar mastery of the aim. The teacher asks one scholar to summarize the learning, uses a mechanism (partner talk) that makes it impossible to really know what each scholar knows, gives an assessment with cumulative review questions only, or runs out of time to give the ET.

Notes:

1) If the aim is poor, it will be difficult to have a great daily assessment because it may not be measurable or aligned to the standards. Additionally, fuzzy aims can also have an impact on the quality of CFUs.
2) A teacher only checking for understanding about procedures and directions (and ***not*** doing CFUs about content) should ***not*** receive a high score on the CFU indicator. A teacher who does not use any CFUs scores a 1.
3) Teacher can/should differentiate the CFU for a SMALL subset of scholars if the general class-wide CFU would not "provide reliable data to assess progress towards the mastery of the aim."
4) In some discussion based lessons, either teacher or student led, it can be difficult to assess whether or not the teacher has reliable data on a certain percentage of the class. In these lessons, the teacher is checking for understanding throughout the entire discussion and should have data based on a percentage of the class that could follow and participate effectively and actively. A lack of participation is useful data as it reveals a lack of understanding that needs to be addressed in that lesson or future lessons.
5) Ways of differentiating the daily assessment can include, but are not limited to, easier questions at the start of an ET, a lower level reading passage, sentence starters, or graphic organizers.

3. A Clear, High Standard for Student Achievement : Academic Rigor					Value: 4 units
	5: Exemplary	**4: Strong**	**3: Solid**	**2: Emergent**	**1: Ineffective**
3a: Rigorous Questioning (2 units) ***Questioning Techniques Include**: Stretch It, Break it Down, Wait Time, questions that prompt connections to prior learning, questions that activate higher levels of thinking by using words such as "analyze," "classify," "compare," "decide," "evaluate," "explain," or "represent."					
Clarity and Alignment	• All key questions are clear and purposefully drive towards mastery of the aim.[1] These questions include written questions in the classroom materials.	• Nearly all key questions are clear and drive towards mastery of the aim. 1-2 times a question is too vague or leading.	• Most questions are clear and drive towards mastery of the aim, but there are 3-4 times when a question is too vague or too leading.	• Questions are aligned to the aim, but they are too leading such that scholars do not have to do the heavy lifting **or** they are vague so that scholars waste time trying to figure out what the teacher is driving towards.	• Questions lack clarity and purpose and do **not drive** towards the aim of the lesson. Questions lead to tangential, non-aim related discussion.
Rigor	• Teacher incorporates both lower-level (remembering and understanding) and higher-level (applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating) questions in a well-scaffolded, ***highly effective*** sequence. • Scholars ask higher level follow-up questions of the teacher and/or their peers that further develop the discussion.	• Teacher incorporates both lower-level (remembering and understanding) and higher-level (applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating) questions in a well-scaffolded, ***usually effective*** sequence.	• Teacher incorporates both lower-level (remembering and understanding) and higher-level (applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating) but the sequence is only ***sometimes*** effective.	• Teacher incorporates both lower-level (remembering and understanding) and higher-level (applying, analyzing, evaluating, and creating) but the sequence is ***rarely*** effective.	• Questions fall **almost exclusively** on the lower levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.
Stretch It[2]	• Teacher ***regularly*** stretches student thinking with questions.		• Teacher ***sometimes*** stretches student thinking with questions.	• Teacher ***rarely*** stretches student thinking with questions.	• Teacher does ***not*** stretch student thinking with questions

Notes:

1) In a reading class a teacher may ask questions that are not specifically aligned towards mastery of the aim, but that aid in comprehending the text as a whole. These questions ultimately support mastery of the aim even if they are not pushing specifically on the aim.
2) Questions to stretch student thinking include, but are not limited to: Why?, What does that relate to?, How do you know?, What is your evidence for that?, or How would you apply this?"

3. A Clear, High Standard for Student Achievement : Academic Rigor					Value: 4 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
3b: Standards for Top-Quality Responses (Oral & Written) (2 units)					
Visual Anchor: Standard of Excellence[1]	• Teacher sets clear expectations for top-quality written work. As an example of top quality work, it is neat, clear, and easy to read so that scholars can reference it during IP. As appropriate, annotations represent a standard of excellence for scholar work and reflect the criteria for success.		• Teacher sets expectations for written work. However, the standard of excellence has one of the following areas of growth a) it is ***not*** displayed for students to reference during independent work, b) the annotations do ***not*** fully reflect the criteria for success, or c) it could be improved in a minor way to increase clarity.	• There is a sample of scholar work, but it does ***not*** represent a standard of excellence or the annotations are random and do ***not*** reflect excellence or the criteria for success.	• There are no examples of excellent written work posted.[1] • The teacher has a visual anchor, but it is never referenced during the lesson
Right is Right[2]	• Almost all scholars provide high quality and accurate responses to questions.	• Scholars mostly provide high quality and accurate responses to questions. • Teacher consistently reinforces that *Right is Right* and refuses to accept low-quality or partially accurate scholar oral responses.	• Scholars ***sometimes*** provide high quality and accurate responses to questions • The teacher ***sometimes*** applies *Right is Right* when appropriate.	• Students ***rarely*** provide high-quality or accurate oral responses. • Teacher only **rarely** applies *Right is Right*. • The lack of *Right is Right* emphasis significantly impedes the depth of scholar understanding.	• Scholars ***do not*** provide high-quality or accurate oral responses. • All answers are accepted by the teacher.
Evidence[2]	• Teacher ***always*** prompts scholars to supply evidence if not included.	• Nearly all scholars answer questions using evidence appropriate to support their answer. • Teacher ***usually*** prompts scholars to supply evidence if not included.	• Scholars ***sometimes*** answer questions using evidence to support their answer. • Teacher ***sometimes*** prompts scholars to supply evidence if not included.	• ***Most*** scholars answer questions without using evidence to support their answer. • Teacher ***rarely*** prompts scholars to supply evidence if not included.	• Scholar responses are one-word and do not provide evidence. • Teacher does not prompt scholars to supply evidence if not included.
Academic Language[2]	• Nearly all scholar responses are top-quality, including the use of standard grammar and complete sentences, with little to no prompting from the teacher.	• Most scholars (>80%) use standard grammar and complete sentences when responding to teacher questions; but when they do ***not***, the teacher efficiently corrects.	• The majority of scholars (>50%) use standard grammar and complete sentences when responding to teacher questions; teacher reinforcement is inconsistent.	• Less than half of scholars use standard grammar and complete sentences when speaking; teacher reinforcement is rare.	• Scholars answer in incomplete sentences, use slang, or incorrect grammar, and this is ***never*** addressed by the teacher.
Account-ability (Oral Responses)[3]	• Teacher uses *No Opt Out* efficiently and cycles back to scholars who didn't answer a question correctly the first time		• Teacher uses *No Opt Out* to cycle back to scholars, but misses 1-2 moments.	• Teacher ***uses*** *No Opt Out* to cycle back to scholars, but misses more than 2 moments.	• Scholars are allowed to opt out. There is no prompting nor consequences for opting out.

Notes:

1) There are some lessons when it is not necessary to display a standard of excellence. If a visual anchor was not necessary, do not score this particular rubric row.
2) In order to achieve a high score on Right is Right, Evidence, and Academic Language, scholars must have ample opportunity to articulate their thinking. If sufficient opportunity is not provided, then the scoring of these categories cannot go above a 2.
3) The accountability for oral responses is focused on the practice of cycling back not in how effective the teacher cycles back. Efficacy can be measured through the use of data section from CFU.

4. Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson: Core Instruction of the Aim					Value: 5 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
4a: Evidence of Planning (3 units)					
Accuracy[1]	• All information is factually accurate. Definitions are clear and precise.		• All information is factually accurate; however, some information and/or definitions are not precise.	• Some information is inaccurate.	• Information is factually inaccurate and could lead to significant scholar misunderstanding.
Misunder-standings[2]	• Teacher has anticipated **all** key scholar misunderstandings, and has proactively planned for many of them.	• Teacher has anticipated and proactively addressed **most** scholar misunderstandings. She/he has applied the "if the students don't get *x*, they won't get *y*" thinking.	• Teacher has anticipated and proactively addressed **some** of the key misunderstandings in the lesson.	• Teacher has anticipated and proactively addressed **few** (1-2) scholar misunderstandings.	• Teacher has ***not*** anticipated scholar misunderstandings.
Concrete to Abstract[2]	• Lesson activities and/or explanations are the most effective at making an abstract concept concrete.	• Teacher effectively makes abstract concepts concrete through the explanation or lesson activities selected. The link between the concrete and the abstract idea/concept is so clear that scholars can state the link between the concrete and abstract in their own words.	• Teacher makes abstract concepts concrete through explanation or lesson activities selected, although the link between the concrete and the abstract idea/concept could be clearer.	• Teacher attempts to make abstract concepts concrete through the explanation or activities selected, but the link between the concrete and the abstract idea/concept is unclear and causes scholar confusion.	• Teacher does not attempt to make abstract concepts concrete for scholars.
Differentiation of Process[2, 3]	• The methods of differentiation are matched perfectly for the needs of the scholar and seamlessly integrated into the lesson.	• Teacher effectively differentiates the process for scholars and it has a significant positive impact on student learning.	• Teacher differentiates the process for scholars. The implementation causes some minor scholar confusion because a method may not be the most effective or a method may be applied at the wrong point in the lesson.	• Teacher ***attempts*** to differentiate the process for scholars, but the differentiation methods **do not improve** learning outcomes for scholars.	• Teacher ***does not attempt*** to differentiate the process for scholars and it has a significant negative impact on their learning.
Visual Anchor: Reference	• When appropriate, the lesson refers to a visual anchor that **effectively** captures key ideas and concepts. • Whether the visual anchor is prepared before the lesson or developed with scholars, it is evident that the teacher has a clear vision for the visual anchor and the purpose it will serve.		• Teacher has thought through the visual anchor in advance, but it **could be more effective** at capturing a key idea or concept by making a minor change.	• The lesson refers to a visual anchor but it is **not effective** in capturing the key ideas and concepts of the lesson (e.g. It may be disorganized, represented in a confusing way, have errors, or have limited purpose).	• There is **no** visual anchor **when it is needed.**

Notes:

1) The most important indicator in this Sub-Essential is accuracy. If a lesson scores a 2 on accuracy, the score for the entire Sub-Essential cannot exceed a 2. Accuracy applies to all parts of the lesson, not just core instruction.
2) Misunderstandings, concrete to abstract, and differentiation of process should be weighted equally when evaluating this section of the rubric. They are presented in this order as this is the order in which a teacher would plan a lesson.
3) There are multiple methods for differentiating the process for scholars, including those which a) change the volume of work, b) present ideas and concepts using multiple modalities to make learning concrete and sticky, and, when appropriate, consider the auditory and visual processing needs of ALL scholars. c) change the rate of work, d) provide increased accountability, and e) provide increased scaffolding (e.g. graphic organizers, extra prompts in questions) beyond what was provided for the whole class.

4. Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson: Core Instruction of the Aim					Value: 5 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
4b: Effective and Efficient Delivery (2 units)					
Most Effective Strategy	• Teacher **effectively** uses agreed upon (by school) best practices for teaching the content matter (e.g. Guided Reading, F&P Continuum, IQWST, Marilyn Burns, network History lesson, enVisions, physics lab etc).		• Teacher uses agreed upon (by school) best practices for teaching the content matter **although** there may be **minor** problems with implementation.	• Teacher **attempts** to use the agreed upon best practice strategy, **but** there are problems with implementation that have **significant** impact on the lesson.	• Teacher does **not** use an agreed upon best practice to teach the content.
Explanation of Material	• Teacher clearly explains new content and concepts, demonstrating strong knowledge of the relevant standards/concepts. Teacher allocates time in explanation to the most important content in a way that leads to **significant** student understanding.	• Teacher clearly explains new content and concepts, demonstrating strong knowledge of the relevant standards/ concepts. Explanations are presented in an efficient way that **increases** student understanding.	• Teacher explanations of new content and concepts are generally clear, but might be not be as **effective or efficient** as possible, thus creating a minor point of confusion or causing the pace of scholar learning to slow unnecessarily.	• Teacher explanations are not effective or efficient. They either lead to **moderate** scholar confusion or significantly slow the pace of scholar learning.	• Teacher explanations are not effective or efficient and lead to **significant** scholar confusion or impede learning progress.
Heavy Lifting	•Scholars enthusiastically do the "heavy lifting" without constant prodding from the teacher; scholars push other students to do more lifting.	• Scholars are required to take on the "heavy lifting" at just the right points during the lesson.	• Scholars do some of the necessary "heavy lifting," but the teacher misses 1-2 key points.	• Scholars do very little of the "heavy lifting." Teacher talk dominates the lesson or scholars are only asked procedural questions.	• Scholars do ***not*** have to do any heavy lifting.
Language	• Scholars can clearly explain the key content and concepts they are learning in their own words.	• Scholars and teacher **appropriately** use academic language and content specific vocabulary during the lesson. • Teacher uses language and explanations that hit the right balance of challenging and kid friendly.	• Teacher **appropriately** uses academic language and content-specific vocabulary during the lesson. • Scholars attempt to use academic language and content-specific vocabulary, but the teacher does not consistently reinforce the use. • Teacher uses language and explanations that hit the right balance of challenging and kid friendly.	• **Some** language or explanations may not be right for the grade level of the scholars—either too challenging, too easy, or not kid-friendly. • Teacher only introduces vocabulary, but does not use it through the lesson • Scholars do not attempt to use academic language and content specific vocabulary.	• Most language or explanations are ***not*** right for the grade level of the scholars—either too challenging, too easy, or ***not*** kid-friendly. • Vocabulary is not taught or reinforced.
Intro to New Material ***(only score for I-We-You lessons)***	• The lesson includes a clear and effective "think aloud", modeling, or other explicit instruction. • The "think aloud" uses a strong example. • Examples and step-by-step processes are thoughtfully planned and clearly delivered.		• The lesson includes a "think aloud", modeling, or other explicit instruction, but it may ***not*** be clear or effective or it is too long. • Step-by-step process explanations might **miss a** step or include an unnecessary, scaffolded step.	• The lesson includes a "think aloud", modeling, or other explicit instruction, but lacks clarity and focus, for example, the example chosen might be a special case or inappropriate for the skill. • Step-by-step process explanations **miss more than one** step or **overly** complicate the process.	• The lesson does ***not*** include a "think aloud", modeling, or other explicit instruction. • Step-by-step process explanations are absent when needed.
Declining Scaffolding ***(only score for I-We-You lessons)***	• Teacher leads scholars through GP with declining scaffolding/ guidance using data from checks for understanding to make those decisions.		• Teacher reduces scaffolding during guided practice, but it is ***not*** based on the understanding scholars are demonstrating. • The reduction in scaffolding is effective for most scholars.	• Teacher provides the same level of scaffolding throughout the entire lesson **or** the level of scaffolding is random and does ***not*** gradually release scholars to independence **or** the "I-We" is muddled, setting up "instructional whack-a-mole."	• There is no evidence of declining scaffolding.

5. Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson: Independent Work Time					Value: 2 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
Multiple At Bats	• Scholars have multiple at bats in order to work towards mastery of the aim independently.		• Scholars work towards mastery of the aim independently, but they don't get a sufficient number of at bats.	• Scholars work towards mastery of the aim independently, but they don't have a sufficient number of a bats **and** part of the practice is not aligned to the aim.	• Scholars **never** work towards mastery of the aim independently. (i.e. no IWT, the IW is not aligned to the aim)
Time ** group and independent*	• Scholars have at least 30% of the lesson to independently process and work towards mastery of the aim. In reading students are in text at least 75% of the total class time.		• Scholars have less than 30% of the lesson to process independently and work towards mastery of the aim. In reading, students are in text at least 60% of the total class time.	• Scholars have very limited time to work independently towards mastery of the aim. In reading, students are in text 40-60% of the total class time.	• Scholars do ***not*** get to work independently because there was no time. In reading, students are in text less than 40% of the total class time.
Difficulty Level	• Independent work challenges scholars but does not exceed the complexity of the lesson.		• The majority of independent work matches the difficulty of instruction, but ***sometimes*** it is either too hard or too easy.	• There is sufficient time for independent work, but because the majority of the work is **too hard,** scholars cannot successfully complete the work independently **or** because the majority of the work is **too easy**, the scholars finish with significant time remaining.	• Scholars do ***not*** get to practice independently.
Differentiated Entry Points[1] and Outcomes	• When appropriate, teacher differentiates entry points and outcomes (*includes extension work*) for independent work and **this maximizes practice time** for all scholars on independent work.	• When appropriate, teacher differentiates entry points and outcomes for independent work and this leads **to increased success** for all scholars on independent work.	• When appropriate, teacher differentiates entry points and outcomes for independent work and this leads to a **minor increase** in success for all scholars on independent work.	• When appropriate, teacher differentiates entry points and outcomes for independent work, but it does **not lead to increased** scholar success.	• The teacher does not differentiate entry points or outcomes to independent work when it is needed.
Feedback and Adjustment[2] ** group and independent*	• Teacher circulates to assess the work of 100% of scholars. • Teacher gives targeted and effective positive and constructive feedback to 100% of scholars. (*In a workshop teacher confers with 100% of the students planned that day).	• Teacher circulates to assess the work of approximately 90% of scholars. • Teacher gives targeted and effective feedback to 90% of scholars. • Teacher insists that scholars redo work not up to standard – and follows through to ensure it is done.	• Teacher circulates to assess the work of most scholars. • Teacher gives feedback to a majority of scholars, but some feedback is too general. • Teacher insists that scholars redo work not up to standard – and follows through to ensure it is done, but the work is only marginally better.	• Teacher attempts to circulate but gets to less than 50% of scholars to assess mastery. • Teacher provides very little effective, targeted feedback during the lesson. • Teacher insists that scholars redo the work, but does not follow through.	• Teacher does not circulate during the lesson and/or does not provide any feedback when circulating. • Teacher never insists that scholars redo work not up to standard.
Group Work (Score only when applicable)	• When used, scholars work together seamlessly, because it is obvious that they have had multiple opportunities to practice working in groups.	• Scholars work effectively and efficiently together to master the aim. • Group work is the most effective mechanism to accomplish the aim. • All scholars contribute to group productivity and show mastery independently.	• All but a few scholars work effectively and efficiently together to master the aim. • Group work is the most effective mechanism to accomplish the aim, **but** some added structure could improve implementation. • All but a few scholars contribute to group productivity and show mastery independently.	• The majority of scholars work effectively and efficiently together to master the aim. • Group work could have been the most effective mechanism to accomplish the aim, but the lesson required additional structure. • The majority of scholars contribute to group productivity, but there are some free riders.	• Group work was an ineffective mechanism to accomplish the aim. • Few scholars contribute to the productivity of the group; free riding off the work of top students is the norm.

Notes:

1) Entry point refers to the point at which a scholar starts independent work. Some ways to differentiate the entry point include easier questions at the start of a worksheet, a lower level reading passage, or staged multiple choice questions before an open ended response. If observing a guided reading group, it may not be appropriate to score because the entry point is already differentiated by reading level.
2) Feedback should include feedback on the quality of written work.

6. Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson: Scholar Engagement					Value: 2 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
6a: Pacing/Maximizing Instructional Time (1 unit)					
Sense of Urgency	• Both teacher and scholars demonstrate a palpable sense of urgency and purpose in the classroom. For scholars, this means that they eagerly "jump" to it, readily volunteer with little to no prompting, or execute the routines efficiently.		• Teacher demonstrates a palpable sense of urgency and purpose in the room, although scholars only ***sometimes*** appear to share in this urgency.	• Teacher demonstrates a mild sense of urgency and purpose in the room. Scholars ***rarely*** demonstrate a sense of urgency.	• Neither the teacher nor scholars demonstrate a sense of urgency or purpose.
Alignment of Time to Activity	• Teacher spends the appropriate amount of time on each part of the lesson.		• In general, the teacher spends the appropriate amount of time on each part of the lesson, but extends or shortens one part of the lesson that has a **minor** impact on learning.	• Teacher spends too much time on one part of the lesson (e.g. 20 minutes on the Do Now) or cuts off guided practice too quickly to address scholar misunderstanding.	• Time allocated to different parts of the lesson appears unplanned and ***not*** purposeful and poor pacing significantly impacts scholar learning.
Routines and Down Time	• Scholars experience **no** down time waiting for the teacher as every minute of instructional time is maximized • Scholars and teachers share in the responsibility for the routines in the classroom that drive the pace of the lesson.	• Scholars experience **little** down time waiting for the teacher. • There is a predictable routine/regular agenda to the class that effectively moves the pace of the lesson.	• Scholars experience **some** down time waiting for the teacher, but it does not have a significant impact overall. • The agenda and routines generally move the pace of the lesson, but one time scholars demonstrate confusion about what they should be doing or a routine/transition takes longer than it should. This loss of time does not have a significant impact on student learning.	• Scholars experience **significant** down time waiting for the teacher. • There are a number of points in the lesson when scholars demonstrate confusion about what they should be doing because they lack a routine.	• Scholars sit idly and there is a palpable sense of time being wasted. (e.g, materials are ***not*** prepared or organized in advance and scholars have to wait for the teacher). • There is ***not*** a predictable routine /regular agenda to the class that effectively moves the pace of the lesson.
Sweat the Small Stuff :Pacing	• The teachers is able to "sweat the small stuff" without having an impact on lesson pacing, through the use of efficient verbal and non-verbal cues.	• When the teacher sweats the small stuff, the impact on lesson pacing is minimal, with 1 minor exception which could have been executed with greater efficiency.	• When the teacher sweats the small stuff, the impact on lesson pacing is generally minimal, with 2-3 minor exceptions which could have been executed with greater efficiency.	• When the teacher sweats the small stuff, the lesson pacing **slows considerably**.	• Teacher does not sweat the small stuff.
Classroom Set-up[1]	• The classroom is intentionally and thoughtfully set up to maximize learning time.		• The classroom set-up supports learning time, but there are minor changes that could be made to maximize instructional time.	• The classroom set-up impedes learning time.	• The classroom set-up is seriously flawed and this has a significant impact on student learning.

Note:

1) When looking at classroom set-up, some aspects to notice are whether or not all scholars can see the board, the teacher can circulate effectively, or if in a seminar all scholars can see each other in order to have an effective discussion.

6. Design and Delivery of an Effective Lesson: Scholar Engagement					Value: 2 units
	5: Exemplary	**4: Strong**	**3: Solid**	**2: Emergent**	**1: Ineffective**
6b: Effective Use of Engagement Strategies (1 unit) **Examples of Engagement Strategies:** Cold Call, Call and Response, Mini-White Boards, Pepper, Choral Response, Non-verbal response, "Everybody writes," Turn and talks, Narrating hands. There is also an overlap between engagement strategies and checks for understanding. **Saphier's Attention Continuum**: Saphier groups the repertoire of attention-getting moves into 5 categories: desisting, alerting, enlisting, engaging, and winning. Skillful teachers effectively match the right move to a given context.					
Scholar Engagement	• Scholars are authentically engaged and invested in their work.	• Scholars are engaged and invested in their work, needing very few reminders (1-2).	• At **some** points in the lesson, **some** students become less engaged and tune out of class. • Teacher may emphasize the importance of completing the assignment, but scholars do ***not*** appear to share in this sense of importance and need 3-5 reminders to stay on task.	• Scholars need **frequent** reminders and corrections to stay engaged with their work. • Scholars are rewarded for silence rather than engagement in the lesson.	• A significant number of scholars are disengaged or disruptive. • Scholars are rewarded for silence rather than engagement in the lesson.
Active Participation	• 100% of scholar hands are in the air in response to most Bloom's 1-2 level teacher questions.	• Approximately 80% of scholar hands are in the air in response to most Bloom's 1-2 level teacher questions.	• Approximately 60% of scholar hands are in the air in response to most Bloom's 1-2 level teacher questions.	• Scholars raise their hands, but participation is relatively low (less than 50% of hands for most questions).	• The majority of scholars do not raise their hands. They are either calling out answers or not participating in class.
Accountability and Variety	• Teacher deliberately chooses engagement strategies that are the best fit for the instructional goals. • Teacher varies the use of strategies to raise or lower the class' energy level.	• Teacher uses a variety of high engagement strategies to ensure that all scholars are accountable. • Teacher selects the right strategy or move at the right time to engage scholars.	• Teacher uses at least two different high engagement strategies that are effective at holding the majority of scholars accountable. • Teacher ***sometimes*** selects the right strategy or move at the right time to engage scholars.	• Teacher uses engagement strategies, although they are ***not*** varied, and they are ***not*** effective in holding the majority of scholars accountable (e.g. teacher may only use one effective engagement strategy). • Teacher ***rarely*** selects the right strategy or move at the right time to engage scholars.	• Teacher only uses strategies that engage one scholar at a time.

7. Classroom Culture					Value: 4 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
7a: High Expectations and Routines (2 units)					
High Behavioral Expectations	• Teacher differentiates strategies so that all scholars meet high expectations.	• Teacher aligns expectations to high behavioral standards and consistently sweats the small stuff (e.g. SLANTing, headings, volume). • Scholars align their own behavior to these high expectations.	• Teacher generally has high expectations and addresses most (but ***not*** all) of the "small stuff." • ***Nearly all*** scholars align their own behavior to these high expectations.	• Teacher aligns expectations to behavioral standards that are not high enough, and only sometimes sweats the small stuff. • ***Most*** scholars align their behavior to high expectations.	• Teacher aligns expectations and routines to **low** behavioral standards, and does not sweat the small stuff. • ***Less than half*** of scholars align their own behavior to high expectations.
Teacher Rationale for Scholar Behavior	• Teacher ***always*** provides rationale for scholar behavior. • Rationale is appropriate for the situation (can be teacher authority, extrinsic, or intrinsic).	• Teacher ***usually*** provides rationale for scholar behavior. • Rationale is ***usually*** appropriate for the situation (1-2 times it is not).	• Teacher ***sometimes*** provides rationale for scholar behavior. • Rationale is ***mostly*** appropriate for the situation (3-4 times it is not).	• Teacher ***rarely*** provides rationale for scholar behavior.	• Teacher **never** gives rationale for scholar behavior.
Clear Expectations	• Expectations have been taught so clearly and consistently that teacher gives very few reminders.	• Teacher sets and reinforces clear expectations with clear *What to Do* statements that are specific, concrete, sequential and measurable.	• Teacher sets and reinforces clear expectations with *What to Do* statements, although these statements could be made more specific, concrete, sequential or measurable.	• Teacher sets clear expectations, but does ***not*** consistently reinforce them or expectations and routines are present but inefficient.	• Teacher does ***not*** set clear expectations.
Feedback on Expectations– Positive Framing	• Scholars celebrate the success of their peers and give each other positive praise without prompting.	• Teacher ***regularly*** uses *Positive Framing* effectively to support classroom expectations.	• Teacher ***sometimes*** uses *Positive Framing* to support classroom expectations, but misses key opportunities or overly narrates when a correction would be more effective.	• Teacher ***rarely*** uses *Positive Framing* or **only** uses *Positive Framing* to correct behavior (when a correction would have been more effective).	• Teacher ***never*** uses *Positive Framing.*
Feedback on Expectations— Do it Again	• There is no need to ask scholars to "Do it Again."	• As appropriate, teacher insists scholars *Do It Again* if it's not great, and this ***consistently*** produces a change in scholar action.	• As appropriate, teacher insists scholars *Do It Again* if it's not great, but this does ***not consistently*** produce a change in scholar action.	• Teacher insists scholars *Do It Again* if it's not great, but this does ***not*** produce a change in scholar action.	• Teacher does ***not*** insist that scholars *Do It Again*.
Corrections	• There are few to no instances of off-task behavior.	• Teacher immediately corrects **all** instances of off-task behavior.	• Teacher immediately responds to **most** instances of off-task behavior.	• Teacher immediately corrects **some** off-task behavior, but more ***frequently*** waits until a problem has grown before addressing it.	• Teacher does not correct off task behavior.
100%	• It doesn't feel like a lot of work to get the class to 100%.	• Teacher insists and gets 95% of scholars on task and engaged with 95% of directions / assignments.	• Teacher insists and gets 85% of scholars on task and engaged, 85% of the time.	• Teacher insists on 100% of scholars on task and engaged most of the time, but less than 85% of scholars are on task less than 85% of the time.	• Teacher ***rarely*** insists on 100%; students are ***rarely*** on task.
Consistency with School Wide Discipline System	• Teacher effectively uses school-wide discipline system as designed, addressing all of the relevant behaviors both with consequences and recognition.		• Teacher fails to address 1-3 behaviors that should have been addressed under school-wide discipline system or addresses them in a way that is inconsistent with the system.	• Teacher fails to address more than three behaviors or otherwise inconsistently or ineffectively uses school-wide discipline system.	• Teacher does ***not*** use school-wide discipline system at all.

7. Classroom Culture					Value: 4 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
7b: Positive Classroom Climate (1 unit)					
Classroom Atmosphere	• There is a strong, palpable sense that students "want it" –their smiles, engagement, and dedication are readily apparent.	• The classroom is ***generally*** a fun, joyful place where scholars are enthusiastic and excited about learning. • The classroom feels like a place where scholars want to be consistently throughout the lesson.	• The classroom is ***usually*** a fun, joyful place where scholars are enthusiastic and excited about learning. • There are real, authentic moments of joy and enthusiasm.	• The classroom is ***sometimes*** a fun, joyful place where scholars are enthusiastic and excited about learning. • There are ***few*** authentic moments of joy and enthusiasm.	• Scholars are bored or unhappy. • The classroom feels dull or apathetic. • Scholars don't appear to care about what they're learning.
Teacher Tone	• Teacher is authentically positive, modeling "*warm-demanding*;" teacher communicates caring as well as high expectations.	• Teacher conveys a positive, up-beat and urgent tone through smiling, humor, challenge, etc.	• Teacher sets a neutral, professional tone, although there are some strong attempts at positivity using word choice, voice modulation, and body language.	• Teacher sets a neutral classroom tone. There are moments when teacher stress shows or a situation could have been handled more positively.	• Teacher tone is overly negative or harsh or teacher inappropriately uses sarcasm.
Planned Joy	• One lesson element is structured in such a way as to be particularly high-interest or "fun" for scholars while still effectively and efficiently addressing the lesson aim. **For example**, **the teacher has a particularly effective hook, leverages chants or cheers, uses humorous or personal examples as a part of the mini-lesson or IP, incorporates a game or competition into the lesson, or gets scholars to demonstrate a deep investment in the content or discipline. This last example is particularly true for high school and specials teachers.**		• One lesson element is structured in such a way as to be particularly high-interest or "fun" for scholars to address the lesson aim, but could show some minor improvement in its efficiency or effectiveness.	• Teacher attempts a high interest or fun lesson element to address the aim, but requires significant improvement to be effective and efficient.	• Teacher ***frequently*** misses opportunities to make learning high interest or relevant to scholars.
Teacher-Student Relationship	• The teacher is very intentional about building relationships with scholars in the classroom by making connections to the scholars' lives, interests, and preferences. **Nearly all** scholars are equally invested in building a positive relationship with the teacher.	• The teacher is intentional about building strong relationships by connecting to the lives, interests, and preferences of scholars. **Most** scholars respond positively to these connections.	• The teacher is proactively building relationships, although scholars generally respond in a neutral way to these attempts at building relationships.	• There is ***little*** evidence that the teacher has strong relationships with the scholars in the class. Teacher action may hamper building relationships with some scholars.	• There is ***no*** evidence that the teacher has strong relationships with the scholars in the class or there is evidence that the teacher "plays favorites."
Positive to Corrective Ratio	• There are ***three times as many*** positive comments as there are corrective comments.		• There are ***more positive*** than corrective comments.	• The ratio of positive to corrective comments is ***about equal***.	• There are ***more corrective*** than positive comments.

7. Classroom Culture					Value: 4 units
	5: Exemplary	**4: Strong**	**3: Solid**	**2: Emergent**	**1: Ineffective**
7c: Embedded Character (1 unit)					
Embedded Character Instruction	• There is an explicit or implicit character aim (in additional to a content aim) that is driving the lesson and both the content and character aim are executed effectively.	• When appropriate, teacher strategically picks lesson examples, literature, and activities that reinforce key messages (e.g. College, Team & Family, REACH). These examples are clear and specific[1].	• When appropriate, teacher strategically picks lesson examples, literature, and activities that reinforce key messages (e.g. College, Team & Family, REACH), but these choices are ineffectively implemented from a character building point of view.	• The lesson design attempts to embed character skills and values, but it is not planned purposefully.	• The lesson design does ***not*** attempt to teach character skills and values.
Teachable Character Moments[2]	• Teacher uses key moments in class to explicitly celebrate and reinforce character skill, particularly emphasizing the importance of hard work and its relation to success. These moments flow naturally from the lesson.		• Teacher explicitly celebrates and reinforces character skills or key values/ messages, **but** misses 1-2 clear opportunities to highlight these skills, values, or messages.	• The teacher ***rarely*** and reinforces character skills or key values/ messages. If the teacher does celebrate scholars, the moment is ***not*** high impact or it takes up too much instructional time.	• Teacher misses ***all*** opportunities to teach character skills and values.
Respect	• Scholars/teachers are nice and respectful to each other. For example, students consistently track one another without prompting. • PETSY (please, excuse me, thank you, sorry, you're welcome) use is extremely common.		• Scholars are generally respectful of the teacher and their peers, but there are some exceptions. The teacher consistently prompts scholars to change behavior in these instances. • Student use of PETSY is inconsistent and is not addressed by the teacher.	• Scholars need significant prompting and redirection to show respect to their peers, but this only sometimes changes student action. • PETSY (please, excuse me, thank you, sorry, you're welcome) is only used by the teacher.	• There is evidence that scholars and teacher are ***not*** respectful to one another (e.g. laughing at one another, saying shut up, etc). • PETSY is ***not*** used by either teacher or scholars.

Notes:

1) A clear and specific example that reinforces key messages like college might include specific statements like "when you are in college and go to the writing center,…" or " when you are working in your study groups in college,…" instead of generic statements, "when you are in college, you will have to work hard."
2) There are many character traits that a teacher can reinforce and celebrate throughout a lesson. For example, scholars should be able to use their own resources during independent practice before raising their hand for support. A teacher would want to celebrate this moment of grit and resilience with the class or scholars individually. Another example might be messaging hard work so that scholars connect their achievements to their hard work.

8. Ensures Achievement for all Scholars: Cumulative Review and Building off Prior Learning[1]					Value: 1 unit
	5: Exemplary	**4: Strong**	**3: Solid**	**2: Emergent**	**1: Ineffective**
Evidence of Accumulated Knowledge	• Scholars independently build off prior learning and integrate review content without teacher direction.	• The teacher explicitly builds off prior learning and weaves in review content; the integration ***consistently*** pushes scholars to articulate connections between new and review content or skills.	• The teacher explicitly builds off prior learning and weaves in review content, however, the integration only ***sometimes*** pushes scholars to articulate connections between new and review content or skills.	• The teacher attempts to build off prior learning and to weave in review content, but the attempt does ***not*** appear to be planned strategically.	• The teacher is not proactively building off prior learning and weaving in review content.
Fast and Systematic	• Scholars initiate cumulative review on their own without teacher prompting (e.g. flash cards, "assign yourself" review packets, etc). • Cumulative review is designed to help scholars understand and correct errors they make (e.g. there is a mechanism for them to check their answers) and there is evidence that scholars go back and re-do work until they get it right.	• Scholars get a routine (daily), fast and well-executed opportunity to systematically and successfully review and practice skills that they have already mastered (e.g. QQ/Do Now, cumulative review activity or game).	• Scholars get an opportunity to systematically review and practice skills, but it could have been more efficient. It appears that CR is part of a daily routine.	• Scholars get an opportunity to systematically review and practice skills that they have already mastered, but the review takes up far too much class time or most scholars are not successful. It is not clear that this is a daily routine.	• There is no cumulative review in the lesson.
High Impact	• Cumulative Review assignments are differentiated based on student data.	• Review targets foundational skills and concepts that scholars will need to be successful in the future. • Standards included in cumulative review are truly review for nearly all scholars.	• Most of the review targets foundational skills and concepts that scholars will need to be successful in the future. • Almost all of the standards included in cumulative review are truly review.	• Review targets a number of skills or concepts that are ***not*** foundational to the course. • Teacher is using review when s/he should be re-teaching; 20% or more of the class cannot successfully complete the review.	• There is no cumulative review in the lesson.

Note:

1) When scoring this section, observers may only be able to score the first line, evidence of accumulated knowledge. If there is also a routine-based, cumulative review time, score all three rows.

9. Outcome: Scholar Learning[1]					Value: 3 units
	5: Exemplary	4: Strong	3: Solid	2: Emergent	1: Ineffective
Outcomes[2]	• At least 95% of scholars master the aim. [3]	• 85-95% of scholars master the aim.	• 75-85% of scholars master the aim.	• 65-75% of scholars master the aim.	• Fewer than 65% of scholars master the aim.
Lesson Development Towards Mastery	• All parts of the lesson effectively move scholars towards mastery of the aim.		• Almost all of the lesson effectively moves scholars towards mastery of the aim.	• Some parts of the lesson are ***not*** aligned to the aim and thus do ***not*** move scholars towards mastery of the aim.	• The lesson is generally disorganized and does ***not*** move scholars towards mastery of the aim.
Student Work Output	• Scholar work on the exit ticket or collected work illustrates exemplary mastery of both learning process and outcomes (i.e. matches expectations as defined by the standard of excellence).	• Scholar work on the exit ticket matches the quality of work defined by the teacher.	• Most scholar work on the exit ticket or collected work illustrates exemplary mastery of both learning process and outcomes.	• Only a few samples of scholar work on the exit ticket or collected work illustrates exemplary mastery of both learning process and outcomes.	• The majority of scholar work on the exit ticket or collected work is unacceptable.
Overall Evaluation	• This lesson was an outstanding use of instructional time, resulting in exceptional levels of student learning for all scholars.	• This lesson was an effective use of instructional time and resulted in significant student learning for almost all scholars.	• This lesson was a good use of instructional time and resulted in solid student learning for most scholars.	• This lesson failed to effectively teach important concepts to a significant minority of the class (at least 25%).	• This lesson resulted in little student learning.

Notes:

1) If the aim for the lesson is ***not*** sufficiently rigorous, the maximum score the lesson can receive for scholar learning is a 3.
2) Scholar learning outcomes should be determined by reviewing the daily assessments after the lesson.
3) There are some lessons where quantifying mastery in terms of percentage goals is not a good indicator of the impact of a lesson. For example, when judging a writing lesson where scholars are revising essays, it is nearly impossible to note as an observer if 85% of scholars mastered the aim. Similarly, in a reading class, we can expect written response to text to provide valuable formative data that is not easily transferable to percent mastery data. Observers will need to apply professional judgment in noting whether the outcomes of the lesson demonstrated effective progress towards mastery.